

REMARKS

Applicant is amending Claims 1-3 and 21-25 to clarify the claimed invention. It is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-13 and 21-25 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending Claims 1-3 and 6 so that the claims no longer recite the objected to terms "intersect" and "not intersect."

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this amendment overcomes the Examiner's objections, and the claims are not indefinite. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-6 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by "Applicant Admitted Prior Art (fig. 7, pages 2-3)." This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 1-3 and 6 to recite the feature of "wherein the gate interconnection and the source interconnection are formed on a same insulating plane, in a

first region.” Hence, the gate interconnection and the source interconnection are in contact with (i.e. on) the same insulating plane, in the first region.

In contrast, “Applicant Admitted Prior Art” does not disclose or suggest this feature. For example, the Examiner states that “Applicant Admitted Prior Art” discloses “the gate interconnection (705) and the source interconnection (707) are formed over a same insulating plane (701).” However, in Fig. 7 of “Applicant Admitted Prior Art,” the gate interconnection (705) and the source interconnection (707) are not on (i.e. in contact with) the same insulating plane, in the first region.

Therefore, independent Claims 1-3 and 6 are not disclosed or suggested by “Applicant Admitted Prior Art,” and Claims 1-3 and 6 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over “Applicant Admitted Prior Art.” Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: July 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500
Customer No. 26568